DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 710 SP 029 945

AUTHOR Driscoll, Amy; And Others
TITLE Portland State University's Cooperative Professional Educational Program: An Alternative Program Response to Reform.
PUB DATE Feb 88
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (New Orleans, LA, February 17-20, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Admission Criteria; Beginning Teachers; *College School Cooperation; *Cooperative Programs; Educational Change; Higher Education; *Internship Programs; *Program Development; *Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; Teacher Interns; Teacher Orientation
IDENTIFIERS *Cooperative Professional Education Program; Portland State University OR

ABSTRACT

A description is given of the Cooperative Professional Education Program (CPEP) that was developed and implemented by a teacher education institution and two public school districts. CPEP differs from traditional programs in the concurrent offering of coursework and clinical experience in an integrated year-long internship. The major components of the program include: (1) the selection process for all participants (interns and support teachers from the public schools); (2) the Individual Learning Plan, developed personally by each intern; (3) collaboration between university and public schools that provides a support team for each intern; and (4) the induction process. Because of the year-long nature of CPEP, the informal induction process begins before certification or hiring. Formally, the CPEP model has an induction phase which provides the beginning teacher with a mentor, an Individual Professional Development plan, and a professional development team to assist. A description of the research and evaluation studies of each major component of the CPEP is juxtaposed with related reform recommendations and concerns to illustrate the program in the context of suggested reforms. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED291710

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY'S COOPERATIVE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM: AN ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM RESPONSE TO REFORM

Amy Driscoll
Portland State University

Nancy Nagel
Pacific University

Jim L. Kuhlman
Portland State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Kuhlman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 1988.

SP 029 945

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY'S COOPERATIVE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM: AN ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM RESPONSE TO REFORM

Introduction

The Cooperative Professional Education Program (CPEP) is a collaborative alternative teacher education program developed and implemented by a teacher education institution and two public school districts. In 1982-83 Portland State University and the districts of Portland and Beaverton engaged in a series of planning meetings prior to the initiation of CPEP and in advance of the release of major reform proposals. This paper describes the program model and reports documentation of its effects.

The 1980's have been a time of numerous critical examinations of teacher education from within the professional community (Howey & Gardner, 1983; Sykes, 1983; Clark, 1984). In 1984 Joyce and Clift published "The Phoenix Agenda: Essential Reform in Teacher Education" calling for a thoughtful and organized approach to change in the preparation of teachers. Their work prompted teacher educators individually and collectively to reflect and respond (Imig, 1984). The Cooperative Professional Education Program (CPEP) responds to those forces within the profession calling for a "radical restructuring" of teacher education (Holmes Group, 1986; Joyce & Clift, 1984) and to forces outside of the profession demanding more public school participation and accountability from institutions of higher education (Clinton, 1985; Carnegie Forum, 1986).

Program Description

The Cooperative Professional Education Program differs from traditional programs in the concurrent offering of coursework and

clinical experiences in an integrated year-long internship, in commitment to ongoing research and development, and in its financial support for the professional development of preservice, beginning, and experienced teachers. CPEP can be illustrated comprehensively in the context of current suggested reforms. In this section the major components of CPEP are juxtaposed with related reform recommendations and concerns. The major components of the Cooperative Professional Education Program (CPEP) include: the selection process for all participants; the Individual Learning Plan; instruction of preservice teachers; collaboration between the university and public schools; and the induction process.

The Selection Process. The selection criteria for interns begins with admission standards for teacher education followed by an intensive screening process for CPEP. Criteria for the CPEP selection include academic excellence in liberal arts coursework, demonstrated skills in organization and communication, and the ability to be self-directed and to take initiative. Interns are interviewed by committees at the university level and the public school level, asked to respond to problem scenarios, and required to make a year-long commitment. Teacher education has been criticized for lack of adequate screening of candidates (Stoddard, Losk, & Benson, 1984) and Carnegie (1986) recommended more restrictive admission to preparation programs.

Criteria for support teachers from the public schools include teaching expertise, communication and supervisory skills, and demonstrated professional leadership. Teachers apply for the support teacher role and their documentation receives committee review. Joyce and Clift proposed that classroom teachers as "clinical practitioners"

be better employed to provide assistance and knowledge in teacher training, and again, Carnegie (1986) recommended that public school staff be selected and developed for the preparation of teachers. The CPEP selection process for supervising teachers is a contrast to common practices for recruitment of cooperating teachers (Griffin, Hughes, Defino, & Barnes, 1981).

Criteria for the selection of university coordinators include exemplary teaching ability, demonstrated supervisory skills, and commitment to research and leadership in teacher education. Joyce and Clift (1984) urged that, "those responsible for training beginning teachers should be scholars concerned primarily with what takes place in classrooms," and the national Commission on Excellence in Education (1985) recommended that teacher education faculty should be able to "model the best teaching."

The Individual Learning Plan. Each CPEP intern participates in the development of his/her own Individual Learning Plan (ILP). The ILP is a set of objectives which reflect expected outcomes of traditional methods coursework and student teaching. The objectives provide for integration of theory and practice in a sequential progression of experiences. The objectives address knowledge and competencies in the areas of elements of instruction, classroom management, student growth and development, learning styles, current research, and curriculum content. Interns, support teachers, and university coordinators cooperatively develop the enabling activities and evaluation processes for each objective. Each intern's ILP is individualized and capitalizes on personal background and experiences as well as adresses needs and interests. The ILP promotes a program of self-study designed toward autonomous and supported professional development.

Interns have the major responsibility to problem solve, take initiative, and creatively design their own experiences within the school context. They are, in effect, Zeichner's (1983) "active agents" in their own professional development.

The Individual Learning Plan and its accompanying processes respond to Carnegie's (1986) admonishment to prepare candidates to "take maximum advantage of the research on teaching and accumulated knowledge of exceptional teachers." The report further urged that preservice teachers should develp their instructional and management skills while cultivating a habit of reflecting on their own teaching practices and beginning a process for continuous professional development. The 1985 AACTE "call for change" strongly reminded the profession that alternative programs should assure the same competencies as those designed for traditional students. The report declared the fundamental difference between alternative and traditional programs be the audience and preparation design, not the content, rigor, or expected outcomes (p.20).

Through the development and implementation of the Individual Learning Plan, CPEP interns experience the following levels of professional development: (1) acquisition by examining research, by observations, by individual reading and study, by discussion with teachers and specialists, and in weekly seminars; (2) application through short-term practice of instruction and management skills in a variety of educational settings; and (3) production through full-time teaching for 6-9 weeks in the assigned classroom. These levels of development match Joyce and Clift's (1984) curricular proposition for teacher education prescribing professional experiences at the same three levels.

Instruction of Preservice Teachers. Throughout the internship, seminars are offered weekly in the major concepts of traditional methods coursework, current issues, research in education, instructional theory and practice, and classroom management. Instructional quality at seminars is critical for immediate application and expectations of exemplary modeling of skillful teaching. The quality issue is addressed by the selection of the expert personnel from the university, school districts, and available consultants, with financial support for selection. The agenda for weekly seminars also includes time for interns to reflect, share, problem solve, and analyze their own experiences. In addition to the seminars, the instructional component of CPEP is individualized through participation in conferences, in-service workshops, district programs, and professional organizations throughout the year. Each intern and support teacher has a financial allotment for such participation. The integration of the ILP's enabling activities, weekly seminars, and participation in professional activities promotes an ethos of on-going professional development and the philosophy that teacher education is a lifelong learning process.

The Public Affairs Report (Stoddard, Losk, & Benson, 1984) criticized traditional teacher education claiming that supervision of student teachers and pedagogical courses are conducted without attention to application of theory through classroom instruction. Joyce and Clift (1984) proposed a teacher education program which provides frequent opportunities to reflect on and integrate experiences. The AACTE (1985) paper recommended that "teachers should be provided professional development opportunities and incentives so that they can consistently improve their practice" (p. 28).

Collaboration Between University and Public Schools. CPEP was originally a collaborative development between Portland State University and Beaverton and Portland public schools. The program was structured to maintain a cooperative link between the institutions through the year-long internship in schools, instruction shared by specialists from both university and districts, and the shared responsibility for evaluation and improvement of the program. An important element of CPEP's collaboration is the support team which is developed for each intern. The support team is composed of the support teacher, school administrator, university coordinator, and academic advisor. The team has the responsibility of assisting in the development of the Individual Learning Plan, approving the ILP, monitoring the intern's progress, and evaluation of the year-long experience. The team approach extends the support and resources available to the intern, as well as maintaining collaboration between the university and the schools.

Support teachers and other district members of the team are supported in graduate coursework through financial reimbursements and specialized coursework offered in the districts as an additional linkage.

Both Carnegie (1986) and the Holmes Group (1986) expressed a critical need to connect schools of education with the public school sector in working partnerships, in a much more direct way than is typically the case now. The Public Affairs Report (Stoddard et al, 1984) recommended "an internship model should be designed through collaboration between school districts and local universities, and resources of both should be available to supervising mentor teachers and teaching interns" (p. 6). CPEP's support teachers match the Joyce

and Clift (1984) vision of "cooperating teachers collaborating as skill trainers in laboratories" (p. 13). One administrator participating in the support team described CPEP as providing the opportunity for "each of us (university and public school) to do what we know best" (Bourke, 1987).

Induction Process. The Cooperative Professional Development Program addresses the issues of induction both informally and formally. During the internship, preservice teachers are informally inducted as they experience the organization, adaptations, curricula, social and political structures of a school in a year-long time frame. Research documenting these experiences demonstrated that interns viewed a comprehensive school context with complexities beyond a school or classroom setting (Driscoll & Strouse, 1988).

Because of the year-long nature of CPEP the informal induction process begins before certification or hiring. The intern progresses generally from individual, small group, to whole class instruction; from observor to cooperative planner, to full responsibility for all planning, implementation, and management. Interns are considered faculty members in their assigned settings, and participate in all teacher responsibilities, meetings, committees, and social gatherings.

Formally, the CPEP model has an induction phase, the Cooperative Teacher Induction Phase (CTIP) which provides the beginning teacher with a mentor, an Individual Professional Development Plan for ongoing self-study and growth, and a Professional Development Team to assist, provide feedback and resources, and to monitor and guide the Individual Professional Development Plan.

There is consensus in the "calls for reform" that a gradual

induction period into full-time teaching and management of a classroom is needed. Additionally there is strong support for continued professional growth beyond the initial preparation period, and an induction period beyond the provisional certificate. With respect to induction, there is again an urging for collaborative programs.

Summary. The description of major components of the Cooperative Professional Education Program supported by current criticisms and recommendations in teacher education reform demonstrates the feasibility of responding to reform in an alternative program. In a profession which has witnessed little innovation in the preparation of teachers in the last 50 years (Drummond & Andrews, 1980; Warren, 1985) and is currently faced with drastic and potentially exciting movements to change, the Cooperative Professional Education Program offers a unique approach to teacher education. The major concepts of the CPEP model stand confidently in the context of the conscientiously prepared, research-based and comprehensive agenda collectively proposed by the current "calls for reform."

Research and Evaluation

From the beginnings of the Cooperative Professional Education Program's implementation, there has been a commitment to ongoing research and evaluation. Representatives from both university and school districts meet regularly to review strengths and difficulties, to assess program effectiveness, and to modify appropriate program elements.

A Follow-Up Study

After the initial years of CPEP's implementation, two small scale studies were conducted. The first followed thirty elementary and secondary education interns into their first teaching positions to

assess program strengths and limitations, and to view professional self-evaluations. There was general agreement that the program had prepared interns for "what we were going to need in our first classrooms" (Carl & Montgomery, 1984). The strengths in preparation included instructional and classroom management skills, content area knowledge, communication and relationships in school contexts, and work with parents and community members. The limitations included preparation in evaluation and individualization of instruction. Former interns as first year teachers preceived themselves to be more competent and confident than perceptions reported by traditional program graduates. In the same study, the administrators in supervisory roles for the former interns also rated their professional competencies. These ratings were also considerably higher than those given to graduates of traditional programs.

A Comparison of Preservice Teachers in CPEP and Traditional Programs

In the second study, a sample of eight CPEP interns in elementary education were interviewed at intervals throughout their internship. A demographically matched sample of eight students in the final year of traditional teacher preparation were also interviewed. At a point of one third completion of the internship, CPEP preservice teachers were compared with traditional preservice teachers at the completion of their preparation. CPEP interns described significantly different concerns, satisfactions and disatisfactions, strengths, research understandings, and sociological perspectives of schools than students completing traditional programs (Driscoll & Strouse, 1986). Since the interns had only completed one third of the program, some of the differences may be traced to the selection process for interns. The only commonality found was a limitation in science and social science

instruction.

The same interns were interviewed at the end of their internship and their responses indicated changes (Driscoll & Strouse, 1988) not usually reported in the literature studying traditional preservice teachers (Nagel, 1987). Professional satisfactions centered about student learning, concerns focused on individual student needs, and sociological perspectives indicated a wide range of experiences with professionals and a broad view of schooling beyond an individual classroom. Self-evaluations described instructional competence, content area knowledge, and a readiness to begin. The major concern raised was lack of time and need for accompanying time management skills, not a surprising concern in view of the demands of both teaching and the internship.

The "Learning to Teach" Study

The most recent investigations of the Cooperative Professional Education Program responded to Schalock's (1983) recommendations for methodological changes in studying teacher education and to the paucity of descriptive investigations of clinical experiences. Zeichner's (1986) posit of individual and institutional influences on the development of teacher perspectives directed the following investigation of CPEP's effects.

Study Description. A descriptive study employing quantitative and qualitative methodology followed six CPEP interns through a year of "learning to teach" (Nagel, 1987). Three major research questions guided the study design, data collection and analysis, and development of conclusions and implications. The study addressed reported sources of "learning to teach," the presence or absence of changes in professional concerns during the internship, and ongoing

self-assessment of intern teaching with descriptions of evaluative rationales.

The intern sample kept daily journals, conducted weekly self-evaluations, and reported sources of teaching ideas and professional concerns. The researcher was a participant observor in a supervisory role conducting regular observations, feedback conferences, participating in seminars and reflection sessions, and interacting weekly on matters of logistics, support, and coordination. The limitations of the supervisory role to the research were balanced by the strengths of extensive data collected in the role.

Findings: Reported Sources of Influence. When describing the sources from whence they "learned to teach," interns most frequently reported that their ideas or strategies came from seminars. The presentation of seminar concurrently with practice application may have contributed to the high incidence of seminar influence reported. This finding is in contrast with field experience literature originating in traditional programs. According to Haberman (1983), an accepted conclusion is that cooperating teachers have the greatest influence on preservice teachers. In this study, the second most reported influence was the support teacher. Interns attributed ideas about classroom routines and curriculum to these practitioners, but only reported their influence on 16% of their teaching ideas in contrast to 41% reported for seminar influence. Interns described themselves as sources of 15% of their teaching ideas and observations of teachers and classrooms as sources of 10% of their teaching ideas. Neither of these influences are found in the literature on student teaching. A possible explanation of the "self" as source for interns was the year-long experience with opportunity to integrate the variety of

other sources spontaneously available into personal teaching ideas. Silvernail and Costello (1983) found that major influences on teaching behavior occur prior to entering the field experience. Some of the interns' previous experiences may have influenced their description of "self" as source of teaching ideas. In explanation of "observations" as sources, the structure of CPEP may account for such influence. Generally during student teaching, the experience is limited to one classroom or one school. CPEP experiences respected Goodlad's (1983) concern that prospective teachers need multiple experiences with exposure to varied instructional techniques. Meeting the objectives of the Individual Learning Plan required interns to observe in numerous classes, grade levels, district settings, and for secondary interns, in other content areas. These opportunities integrated throughout the entire internship are different from the traditional practice of student teaching with the teaching model limited to the cooperating teacher.

Findings: Professional Concerns. The concept of teacher concerns is based on Fuller's (1969) Concerns Theory and research which demonstrated that preservice teachers move from concerns with self to concerns with students and back to concerns with self in the course of traditional clinical experiences (Fuller, Parsons, & Watkins, 1973; Silvernail & Costello, 1983). CPEP interns reported an almost identical pattern of concern shifts spread over the internship time period. While this finding replicates those yielded by previous investigations conducted in the context of traditional programs, the content of the self category was different. A theme of the concerns with self was the role of interns as students of teaching. Interns referred to the requirements and demands of CPEP and the completion of

coursework through the Individualized Learning Plan in their concern descriptions. The rigor of the program may account for this finding.

Findings: Self-Assessment of Teaching. The ratings of interns in asessing their teaching increased gradually during the internship. The important data for this study however was the rationales for the ratings. In answer to the "why" question on the self-assessment form, interns reported the use of instructional techniques most frequently. Next they reported student learning behavior as their rationale, and self-adequacy as their third most frequent rationale. The reported rationale statements were classified into four categories, and the least frequently described rationale focused on classroom management issues.

Although the ratings varied from intern to intern, the rationales observed a common pattern during the internship. This pattern could be traced to patterns in seminar content, and to levels of teaching experiences as interns progressed to full classroom responsibility. An additional finding was significant. Interns frequently described continued use of self-assessment procedures after the data collection process was complete. The participant-observer role of the researcher allowed this finding to emerge. Its significance is supported by Zeichner and Liston's (1987) admonishment to teacher education professionals to work toward reflective preservice teachers. The kinds of questionning and plans for change expressed in the intern self-assessments indicate a growth toward such reflective practice.

Summary. The findings of this study indicate that the Cooperative Professional Education Program is preparing preservice teachers who have the ability and attitude of reflecting on their teaching beliefs and knowledge beyond a level of "imitation" to the creation of

personal models of teaching. This research supports the provision of multiple sources of influence through observations and teaching experiences, attention to the sequence and content of seminars conducted concurrent with field experiences, promotion of the practice of reflection and self-assessment during preservice experiences, and addressing and supporting prospective teachers' concerns during field experiences.

Induction Experiences of CPEP Graduates

In addition to calling attention to teacher education at the preservice level, the major calls for reform (Carnegie, 1986; Holmes, 1986) have focused on the induction level. Among the recommendations are provision of mentoring systems or relationships and appropriate staff development programs (Burke & Heideman, 1985).

The experiences of beginning teachers have received intense research attention during the last ten years, however, existing data lacks contextual descriptions and amplification of the day to day work life experiences of beginning teachers. Such research information must precede major reform efforts for induction programs. Additionally, there is no research information about the induction experiences of teachers who have completed an alternative preparation program specifically with an extended internship.

Study Description. The research design for this study (Kuhlman, 1987) emerged from queries about the self-perceptions, professional concerns and sentiments, and sources of influence attributed to teaching practices. In addition, hiring variables and school environment differences were examined for effects on first year experiences.

The subjects for this study were four first year teachers who completed the Cooperative Professional Education Program previously

described. The study was built primarily on qualitative research tradition for data collection. Data was collected by means of interviews, observations, and journal recordings. Interviews were conducted three times during the first year using a protocol with items matched to the previously described preservice research questions. Observations took two forms: a day long "shadowing" of all instructional and non-instructional responsibilities with teacher behavior recorded at two minute intervals throughout the entire school day; and a videotape recording of a half day of instruction. An additional data source was the generation of teacher perceptions of their teaching in a "stimulated recall" session viewing previously videotaped lessons. Journal recordings were intended to extend the observational data in building a profile of the professional day of these first year teachers and to capture professional sentiments experienced in the intervals between interviews.

Data collection was extensive and some limited preliminary findings are available at this writing. Initial analysis has already yielded categories of ideas, and themes which characterize the professional thinking of this sample of beginning teachers. Some of these themes are examined in contrast to existing literature and for extension of the preservice research findings.

Professional Concerns, Sentiments, and Self-Perceptions. In the responses describing concerns, two major themes emerged at the beginning of the school year: concerns with time management, and concerns with instructional effectiveness. At the end of the school year, the major concern continued to be time management expressed for the teachers themselves and for the classroom. Other end of the first year concerns included the need for new challenges, and

self-improvement aimed at increasing student productivity.

The tone which accompanied expressed sentiments about their professional experiences indicated enjoyment, pleasure, and pride. Examples of the sentiments provided clear indications of confidence: "I really feel good about my teaching," "I feel very successful," "It has been a great year," "The students are pretty positive toward me in their attitudes," and "I am probably the best first year teacher you are going to see." When describing least satisfying experiences, these first year teachers echoed those reported in the induction literature (Varah, Theune & Parker, 1986; Veenan, 1984): logistics, paperwork, scheduling, time constraints on curriculum, interruptions, and some personal relationships with other staff.

The self-perceptions of these four beginning teachers displayed two significant changes as their first teaching year progressed. By the end of the year, they became increasingly more self-critical about their teaching while maintaining a tone of confidence. This evidenced in their descriptions of specific aspects of their instruction and its impact on students. It was congruent with their concern for challenge and revision in future teaching.

Unlike most novice teachers, these four CPEP graduates felt relaxed about classroom management, had "no major problems with discipline." Their management goals were consistent throughout the year - "students will be self-sufficient," "independence and involvement in decision making," and "concentration on problem solving." The teachers described themselves as "participation managers."

Classroom arrangements were characterized as structured early in the school year. All four teachers were however critical of these

initial arrangements and described and made changes during the year to "meet the needs of students."

Commentary from "Stimulated Recall" Sessions. Three categories of commentary emerged from teachers as they viewed their videotaped teaching. The commentary was gathered naturalistically; the former interns were asked to articulate their thinking about what they saw and to stop the viewing whenever they had a question or comment. Following their spontaneous comments, they were asked to assess their strategies and to indicate the source of influence. A category of concerns emerged from the spontaneous comments, and the questions which followed yielded the remaining categories of idea sources and assessment.

The first category, concerns about their teaching, was composed of concerns about individual students, teaching strategies, curriculum, and classroom management. Of these foci, concerns about individual students were expressed most, and concerns about classroom management were expressed least. When describing curricular concerns, the subjects generally described deficits or limitations in programs. When they expressed concern about their teaching strategies, they accompanied their concern with an alternative strategy for future instruction.

In the second category, the subjects referred to former support teachers, other teacher peers, inservice programs, and self as sources for teaching ideas. They most frequently attributed ideas to themselves, and these expressions were accompanied by an affect of confidence and enthusiasm. Former support teachers were mentioned as the next most frequent source of ideas.

In the third category, these beginning teachers were self-critical twice as much as self-praising. Several expressions of lack of slef-awareness due to the pace of teaching and the constraints of non-instructional responsibilities emerged, accompanied by a wish for observations and assessment from sources outside the school district.

Summary. Extensive data is yet to be analyzed and described, yet these initial findings yield direction for development efforts at both preservice and induction levels. A number of differences between the preservice research findings and this induction study's findings are noteworthy. During the first year of teaching, professional concerns moved from the self focus expressed by preservice teachers at completion of their internship to a student focus expressed by the beginning teachers. Seminars were no longer described as sources of influence by beginning teachers, but their former support teachers remained an importnt influence. Several consistencies between the two studies' findings are also important. The nomination of self as an important source of teaching ideas, and the tendency to be self-critical of their teaching were observed in both preservice and induction samples. Time management remained a critical professional concern as interns moved into teaching positions and as they completed the first year.

Further analysis and study is warranted for description of professional experiences of beginning teachers. There is a quality of optimism in the preliminary findings of this induction study, but additional investigation must continue the probes begun here. The Cooperative Professional Education Program appears to achieve significant effects at both the preservice and induction levels in

terms of preparing confident, competent, reflective professionals.

Recommendations of this work and of the reform agenda include continued indepth study of teacher education programs, and production of information applicable to program development, policy decisions, and future reform. It is hoped that future calls for reform can base improvements on a growing research knowledge base in teacher education.

References

Bourke, P. (1987). Personal communication. Portland, OR.

Burke, R. & Heideman, R. (1985). Career-long teacher education. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Carl, M. & Montgomery, S. (1985). Follow-up study: Cooperative Professional Education Program. Portland, OR: Portland State University.

Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York, NY: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Clark, D. L. (1984). Better teachers for the year 2000: A proposal for the structural reform of teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 116-120.

Driscoll, A. & Strouse, J. (1986). Portland State University's Cooperative Professional Education Program model. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Social Science Association, Seattle, Washington.

Driscoll, A. & Strouse, J. (1988). Portland State University's Cooperative Professional Education Program: A teacher education alternative. Teacher Education Quarterly, forthcoming.

Drummond, W. H. & Andrews, T. E. (1980). The influence of federal and state governments on teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 62, 97-99.

Fuller, F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal, 6(2), 207-226.

Fuller, F., Parsons, J., & Watkins, J. (1973). Concerns of teachers: Research and reconceptualization. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas.

Goodlad, J. (1984). A place called school. New york, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Griffin, G., Hughes, R., Defino, M., & Barnes, S. (1981). Student teaching: A review. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of texas.

Holmes Group (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group, Inc.

Howey, K. & Gardner, W. (1983). The education of teachers:

A look ahead. New York, NY: Longman Press.

Joyce, B. & Clift, R. (1984). The Phoenix Agenda: Essential reform in teacher education. Educational Researcher, 13, 5-17.

Kuhlman, J. (1987). A descriptive study of first year teachers from an alternative teacher preparation program. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Northern Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association, Park City, Utah.

Nagel, N. (1987). A descriptive study of an alternative process of "learning to teach." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Portland State University, Portland.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1985). A call for change in teacher education. Washington, DC: The American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

Schalock, D. (1983). Methodological considerations in future research and development in teacher education. In K. Howey & W. Gardner (Eds.), The education of teachers: A look ahead. New York, NY: Longman Press.

Silvernail, D. & Costello, M. (1983). The impact of student teaching and internship programs on preservice teachers' pupil control perspectives, anxiety levels, and teaching concerns. Journal of Teacher Education, 34(4), 32-36.

Stoddard, T., Losk, D. J., & Benson, C. S. (1984). Public affairs report on the education of educators: Preparing and retaining excellent teachers. Berkeley, CA: Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California.

Sykes, G. Contradictions, ironies and promises unfulfilled: A contemporary account of the status of teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 87-93.

Varah, L., Theune, W., & Parker, L. (1986). Beginning teachers: Sink or swim? Journal of Teacher Education, 37(1), 30-34.

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. Review of Educational Research, 54(2), 143-178.

Warren, D. (1985). Learning from experience: History and teacher education. Educational Researcher, 14, 5-12.

Zeichner, K. M. (1983). Alternative paradigms of teacher education. Journal of teacher education, 34, 3-9.

Zeichner, K. M. & Liston, D. P. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. Harvard Educational Review, 57(1), 2-48.